

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Prior to entry of this amendment, the application included claims 1-46. A final office action mailed April 25, 2006, rejected claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,968,503 to Chang et al. (“Chang”). Claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of US Patent No. 6,457,066 to Mein et al. (“Mein”).

This amendment amends claims 1, 22-24, 29-32, 33 and 36-39 and cancels claims 13, 28 and 35. No claims have been added. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-12, 14-27, 29-34 and 36-36 stand pending for examination.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “an access management system comprising an identity system for managing identity profiles and an access system for providing security of resources across one or more web servers,” and to recite “the access management system managing a template that indicates parameters for defining workflows.” Because these amendments are similar to elements recited in claim 13, that claim has been canceled to avoid redundancy. Additional support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found throughout the specification, including, inter alia, at lines 9-20 on page 8 of the application. Claims 22 and 33 have been amended in similar fashion to claim 1, and claims 28 and 35 have correspondingly been canceled.

Claim 22 has been amended to more clearly point out that a software product with instructions (and not a method) is being claimed, by reciting instructions for performing procedures instead of reciting method steps. Dependent claims 23, 24 and 29-32 have been amended in similar fashion. Likewise, claim 33 has been amended to more clearly point out that an apparatus (i.e., an access system), and not a method, is being claimed. Dependent claims 36-39 have been amended similar fashion. It is submitted that these amendments are cosmetic in nature and do not affect the scope of the amended claims.

It is respectfully submitted that, because these amendments incorporate elements similar to those found in existent claims, the amendments should be entered and considered even though a final office action has been issued.

## **§ 102 Rejections**

The final office action rejected claims 1-45 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang. These rejections are respectfully traversed. In an office action mailed December 13, 2005, the Office first rejected claims 1-45 as being anticipated by Chang. In response to that office action, the applicants mailed, on March 13, 2006, a response, which explained that Chang fails to teach or suggest each element of any independent claim in the application. Specifically, the applicants' response explained why Chang does not teach or suggest either "accessing a template that indicates parameters for defining workflows" or "creating a definition of a first workflow for managing at least one identity of at least one entity, based on said template," both of which are recited by each independent claim in the application.

The final office action maintained the rejections of claims 1-45. The applicants respectfully maintain their traversal of these rejections, for at least the reasons expressed in their earlier response. In the interest of expediting prosecution, however, the claims have been amended herein to more clearly highlight certain distinctions between the pending claims and the cited references, and reconsideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite, in the preamble, "an access management system comprising an identity system for managing identity profiles and an access system for providing security of resources across one or more web servers." (This amendment is similar to prior claim 13, which recited, "the identity system is integrated with an access system.") Claim 1 also has been amended to recite "the access management system accessing a template that indicates parameters for defining workflows." Chang fails to teach or suggest an access management system as claimed, let alone the step of an access management system accessing a template that indicates parameters for defining workflows.

Instead, Chang "relates to an XML user interface used in a workflow server," Chang, c. 1, ll. 8-9, in which "a workflow server system is provided which uses an XML

namespace designed to execute various workflow server services.” *Id.*, c. 1, ll. 53-55. “The workflow server may include an XML Execution Engine, which uses the XML namespace to execute commands issued by the user from a web browser.” *Id.*, c. 1, l. 55-57. “The Workflow Server passes a user command to an XML Execution Engine, accesses an XML namespace to determine how to execute said command, executes said command, accessing a database if necessary, and returns an XML document back to user for display on the user's web browser, said XML document containing a reference to an XSL file.” *Id.*, c. 1, ll. 61-67.

Clearly, Chang is directed not to an access management system, but instead to a “workflow server” that has nothing whatsoever to do with access management; rather, Chang’s workflow server is used to track information and manage processes such as, for example, patient records and procedures in a medical practice. *See, e.g.*, Chang, c. 17, ll. 30-67. Nothing in Chang teaches or suggests that the workflow server might comprise (or be included in) an access management system comprising an identity system for managing identity profiles and an access system for providing security of resources across one or more web servers.

It is worth noting that, with respect to former claim 13, which recited that “the identity system is integrated with an access system,” the final office action cited column 18, lines 50-67 of Chang, which teaches, in its entirety,

Each user request is running in a ‘current request context’. The current request context in CW 5.0 includes:

Current session  
Current user  
Current order  
Current patient

Since, after a successful login, each workflow server request must contain a valid session ID, the workflow server automatically sets the current session and current user context based on the passed session ID. However, current patient and order context must be set before a <xml:Patient> or a <xml:Order> tag can be processed, otherwise a run-time error will be returned.

Chang, c. 18, ll. 50-67. The final office action seems to imply that the disclosure of “a successful login” somehow teaches or suggests that an identity system might be integrated with an access system. Even assuming this implication is true (which applicants would dispute), nothing in this disclosure expressly teach or suggest the access management system recited by

claim 1, let alone that such an access system might “access[] a template that indicates parameters for defining workflows,” as recited by claim 1. Moreover, the final office action identifies (and a review of Chang reveals) no other disclosure that reasonably could be read to teach or suggest this element of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Chang, and reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22 and 33 have been amended in similar fashion to claim 1, and they are believed to be allowable at least for similar reasons. Dependent claims 2-12, 14-21, 23-27, 29-32 and 34 and 36-45 each ultimately depend from either claim 1, claim 22 or claim 33, and they are believed to be allowable at least because of their dependence from allowable base claims. Consequently, reconsideration of the § 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

### **§ 103 Rejection**

Claim 46 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Mein. Claim 46 ultimately depends from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable at least because of that dependence. Consideration of the rejection under § 103 is respectfully requested as well.

## **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2006

/Chad E. King/

Chad E. King

Reg. No. 44,187

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
CEK/jln  
60771156 v1